

THE CIRCULAR.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.]

DEVOTED TO THE SOVEREIGNTY OF JESUS CHRIST.

[EDITED BY J. H. NOYES.]

VOL. I.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., NOVEMBER 23, 1851.

NO. 3.

TERMS AND MEANS.

The Circular may be obtained WITHOUT MONEY, by application through the mail; or at the office of publication, No. 43 Willow Place, Brooklyn.

Those who choose to pay, may send ONE DOLLAR for a yearly volume.

Price of single copies, when exposed at book-stores, &c., TWO CENTS.

As a FREE press must have other resources than its subscription list, all who are interested in the establishment of such a press, and in the principles of this paper, are invited to co-operate by systematic MONTHLY contributions.

Communications should be addressed to—
"THE CIRCULAR, Brooklyn, N. Y."

THE CIRCULAR may be obtained at Adriaance, Sherman & Co's., No. 2, Astor House; and at Fowler & Wells', 129 and 131 Nassau street, N. Y.

From The Witness, of November 1841.

Apostolical Succession.

The 'Oxford Tract' writers, in common with the Papists, give the clergy of their own church a monopoly of the business of dispensing salvation, in the following manner: 1. The reception of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, say they, are indispensable to salvation. 2. The efficacy of those ordinances to save men, depends on the validity of the ordination of the priest who administers them. 3. The only valid ordination is that which has come down from the apostles, by regular transmission from bishop to bishop, in the Episcopal and Romish churches. In other words, Christ, they say, gave the apostles the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and they gave them to their successors; and so those keys have come into the hands of the present bishops and priests of the old hereditary churches, to the exclusion of all dissenters and heretics whatsoever. Now the basis of this whole superstructure, is the assumption, that the ecclesiastical organization instituted by Jesus Christ and his apostles, was designed to continue in the world through successive generations, till the end of time; and that the authority which Christ gave his apostles, he intended also to give their successors. This assumption rests almost entirely on one little text: viz., Matt. 28: 20—"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." That this is the corner-stone of the hereditary churches, any one may see by reading the first volume of the 'Tracts for the Times.' This text is there quoted almost exclusively, on all occasions where proof of the continuation and present existence of the original organization is required. In a cursory perusal we counted twenty instances in which it is thus quoted. A few of those instances we will here introduce, to show the purport and bearing of the whole:—

"Our Lord ended the sentence in which he endued them [the apostles] with power to baptize, with the promise of his assistance in the discharge of their functions through all time. 'Go,' said he, 'baptize all nations: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world:' a phrase which, as addressed to mortal men, must clearly have been understood as a promise of continual assistance to them and to their successors." Vol. I., p. 33.

"It would lead us into endless difficulties were we to admit that, when administered by a minister duly authorized according to the outward forms of the Church, either Baptism or the Lord's Supper depended for its validity either on the moral and spiritual attainments of that minister, or on the frame of mind in which he might have received, at his ordination, the outward and visible sign of his authority. . . . The very question of worth, indeed, with relation to such matters, is absurd. Who is worthy? Who is a fit and meet dispenser of the gifts of the Holy Spirit? What are, after all, the petty differences between sinner and sinner, when viewed in relation to him whose eyes are too pure to behold iniquity, and who charges his very angels with folly? And be it remembered that the apostolic powers, if not transmitted through these, in some instances corrupt channels, have not been transmitted to our times at all. Unless then we acknowledge the reality of such transmission, we must admit that the Church which Christ founded is no

longer to be found upon the earth, and that the promise of his protection, so far from being available to the end of the world, is forgotten and out of date already." p. 37.

"That the apostles were in some sense or other to remain on earth to the end of all things, is plain from the text, 'Lo I am with you alway,' &c." p. 48.

"Dr. Spencer.—Our Lord promised to be with his apostles in their character of teachers and baptizers of the nations, alway, even unto the end of the world. What did he mean by that?"

"John Evans.—He could not mean that Peter, James, or John, or their brethren, were to live forever on earth: for we know that they are long since dead.

"Dr. S.—Certainly not; and we must therefore ascribe to his words the only other meaning which they can reasonably bear. As he could not have spoken of the persons of the apostles, he must have spoken of their offices. He must have meant that though Peter, James, and John, should be taken from the world, the true Church should never be left without apostles, but be guided by their successors to the end of time." p. 229.

[The commission given to Peter in Matt. 16: 19,] "has been handed down, by the laying on of hands, from bishops to bishops, and will so continue to the end of time, according to that promise, whereby our Lord engaged to continue with them in the exercise of it, when he said to the apostles, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'" p. 261. See also pages 46, 48, 60, 89, 227, 341, 361, 383, 407, 433.

The reader will perceive that the value of this corner stone of Oxfordism depends on the interpretation of the expression, 'even unto the end of the world.' The tract writers coolly assume that it means, 'through all time,' 'to the end of all things,' 'to the end of time,' and then they are at liberty, may they are obliged to expand the promise of Christ thus: 'Lo, I am with you and your successors, even unto the end of the world.' Now it is too great a tax on our charity to believe that the professors and inmates of a university so thoroughly steeped in Greek literature as that of Oxford, are ignorant, and therefore honest in this assumption. A very slight examination of parallel passages, even in the English New Testament, might have given them an insight into the meaning of the expression 'the end of the world,' which would have nullified the whole argument which they have built upon it. We are constrained to believe that they are willing to take advantage of a mistranslation and a consequent popular misapprehension, for purposes of imposture; and that they feel secure in doing so, because the mass of their opposers, the dissenting clergy, consent to the prevalence of the same misapprehension, and avail themselves of it in like manner.

The Greek word *aión* which is translated 'world' in Matt 28: 20, and elsewhere through the New Testament, according to all competent lexicographers and commentators, refers not to the earth, but to a division of time, and should be translated *age*, or *dispensation*. Robinson explains the matter thus:—

"The Jews were accustomed to dispute concerning the *two ages* of the world, the one of which they called the 'present age or world,' the other 'the age or world to come.' The former, in their opinion, was to comprehend the time from the creation to the advent of the Messiah, and was marked by imbecility, imperfection, ignorance, vice, and calamity. The latter they referred to the joyful time when the Messiah should come in majesty to establish his dominion: when he should subdue to himself all kingdoms, recall the dead to life, sit in judgment, &c.; when, in short, he should introduce a new era, distinguished by liberty, knowledge, piety, and felicity."—*Lexicon, article AION*.

Bishop Newton, of the Episcopal church, (who ought to be good authority at Oxford,) commenting on Matt: 24: 3, says—

"The end of the world, or the conclusion of the age, is the same period with the destruction

of Jerusalem; for there being *two ages* among the Jews, the one *under the law*, the other *under the Messiah*; when the city and temple were destroyed, and the Jewish polity in church and state dissolved, the former must of course be concluded, and the age under the Messiah commenced."

The correctness of these expositions, and the utter absurdity of any other, is seen at a glance by consulting even the English versions of 1 Cor. 10: 11,—'All these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come;'—and Heb. 9: 26,—'Now once in the end of the world hath he [Christ] appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.' What world was that, the end of which had come upon the primitive church? What world was that, in the end of which Christ appeared? The only answer that can satisfy common sense, is, the world or age or dispensation of Mosaic Judaism, which came to an end at the destruction of Jerusalem. Christ clearly determined the meaning of the expression, 'the end of the world,' in the 24th of Matthew. His disciples asked him what should be 'the sign of the end of the world?' He answered, 'This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.' Ver. 3, 14. What goes before this answer, viz., predictions of events which actually preceded the final overthrow of Judaism; and what follows after it, viz., predictions of the invasion of the Roman army and the siege of Jerusalem; utterly forbid the application of it to any other event than the termination of the Mosaic economy. If it is objected that the sign of the end, viz., the universal preaching of the gospel, did not come to pass before the destruction of Jerusalem, we join issue with the objector on this point, and appeal to Mark 16: 20, Rom. 10: 18, Col. 1: 6, 23. If the objector is disposed to appeal from scripture to external history, we will go with him even there. Eusebius, the father of ecclesiastical historians, is almost the only authority that can be appealed to in relation to the early ages of Christianity. He says in the first chapter of the third book of his ecclesiastical history, that 'the holy apostles and disciples of our Savior, were scattered over the whole world' in the time of Nero, between A. D. 60 and 70; and again in the eighth chapter of the same book, that 'the sound of the holy apostles, went throughout all the earth, and their words to the end of the world,' at the 'very time' when Jerusalem was nigh its destruction.

Christ then had previously defined the meaning of the language he used in his last address to his disciples. He had expressly set the time of the 'end of the world.' His disciples knew that he referred to an event that should come to pass within the time of the generation then living. When he said, 'Go teach all nations'—

* This question, with its context, stands thus:—*When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?* 'These things' in the first clause, refers to the destruction of the temple, predicted in the verse before. Notwithstanding the gross absurdity of supposing that the disciples asked in the same breath, one question about the destruction of the temple, and another about a subject as far removed from that, and from the whole subject of the previous conversation, as the east is from the west, yet some will have it that this question relates to two, or even three widely separate events, viz: 1. the destruction of the temple; 2. the coming of Christ, which is yet future; 3. the final conflagration of the universe. Now, there is one plain fact that ought to make an end of this outrage on common sense forever. Luke, in the parallel passage, (21: 7) records the same question. In the same words, only he uses the expression 'these things,' in the last part of the question, as well as in the first, instead of specifying, as Matthew does, the coming of Christ and the end of the world:—*When shall these things be? and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass?*—

This form of the question plainly shows, that the coming of Christ and the end of the world were so identified as to their time, in Luke's mind, with the destruction of the temple, that he thought it proper to comprise them all under one term.—The question has two parts, viz: first, as to the time: second, as to the tokens: but both parts evidently relate to one complex event; viz, the end of the Mosaic economy, with its concomitants, the destruction of the temple in the outward world, and the second coming of Christ in the spiritual world.

&c., and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world,' he placed in conjunction the very same two events that he joined in Matt. 24: 1-4, viz., the testimony to all nations, and the end of the world. His meaning plainly was, 'It is your business to proclaim the gospel to all nations, previous to the predicted end of the present order of things; and, lo, I am with you till your work is finished.' Or we may paraphrase his language again, thus: 'While I go to my Father, leaving you to publish my gospel to the world, and to encounter the turbulence of the last days apparently alone, still go to your work with good cheer; for I will be with you in spirit through this whole period of my absence in person, even till I come again at the time of the end, according to my promise.' It is perfectly evident that the commission and the promise in Matt. 28: 20, were given to the apostles only. The expression, 'the end of the world,' instead of requiring or authorizing the interpolation of 'their successors,' as the tract-writers argue, absolutely forbids it; for according to the definition of Christ, that expression refers to an event that was to come to pass before they, as a body, could have any successors; i. e. within their own lifetime.

We do not deny that Christ is with those who believe on him, and preach his gospel, in all ages. This is plainly implied in such texts as John 17: 20, Acts 10: 35, and might be inferred from the character of God, without any explicit promise. But we do deny that Matt. 28: 20, furnishes one particle of proof of the continuance of the primitive organization, and apostolic authority, beyond the time of the destruction of Jerusalem; and we affirm that the writers of the Oxford Tracts, learned and devout as they may seem, in making a false interpretation of that text their foundation, have based their whole gorgeous system of ecclesiastical domination on a piece of egregious folly and fraud.

There is one other text, several times quoted in the tracts in connection with Matt. 28: 20, for the same purpose, and with the same impertinence, viz. Luke 12: 42—46, 'Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing!' &c. The following are specimens of the Oxford commentary on this passage.—

"Now I do not inquire *who* in every age are the stewards spoken of, (though in my own mind I cannot doubt the line of Bishops is that ministry, and consider the concluding verses fearfully prophetic of the Papal misuse of the gift;—by the bye, at least it shows this, that bad men may nevertheless be the channels of grace to God's 'household,') I do not ask who are the stewards, but surely the words, 'when he cometh,' imply that they are to continue till the end of the world." p. 60.

"It is asked whether we do not find traces here of a line of ministry to continue in Christ's 'Church' and 'household' until his coming again." p. 341.

Here again is the same false assumption as before, viz. that the 'coming of Christ' instead of having taken place at the time predicted in Matt. 10: 23, 16: 28, 24: 34, &c., is yet a future event. Most of our readers are so familiar with the truth on this subject, that they will smile at the ridiculous ignorance of the learned professor, and we need not labor to expose it.

We have a word to say in conclusion, on the importance of understanding and rightly applying the doctrine of the Second Coming. We are sometimes asked, 'Of what use is our doctrine on that subject, even if it be true?' and some complain that we say too much about it, and magnify it beyond its merits. We will not

defend the air-castles which some have built upon it. But neither will we cease to value and rejoice in it, because some abuse it. The truth is, the Second Coming of Christ, at the end of the Mosaic dispensation, is the most important fact in the whole history of the church of God; a fact, the suppression of which has laid a lie at the very foundation of all that has been called Christianity since the age of the Apostles; a fact, the disclosure of which is destined to demolish the hereditary churches, such as Popery and Episcopacy, on the one hand, and a host of fanaticisms, such as Swedenborgianism, Shakerism, and Millerism on the other. In this view of its bearings, we cannot magnify it beyond its merits. The knowledge and right application of it is as important as the overthrow of Antichrist.

THE CIRCULAR.

BROOKLYN, NOV. 23, 1851.

Sunday Papers.

We have chosen Sunday for our day of publication, for several reasons, among which the following is most important.

Sunday is the day of leisure, and therefore naturally the day for reading. We expect to have a large number of readers in this city, or rather in these cities, and regard it as an object of some importance, that they should receive their papers on their day of leisure. The Circular, however, will be printed on Saturday, and probably in most cases, will be mailed; so that all subscribers within a day's reach of us, will receive their papers on Sunday.

As to the desecration of the Sabbath which may be imputed to us in certain quarters, we offer this apology: 'It is lawful to do good on the Sabbath day.' For instance, it is lawful to preach; and if people will not attend church, it is becoming lawful to preach in the streets, on the Sabbath day. But many persons will neither attend church, nor stop to hear a street preacher. For them, we hold it to be lawful and useful to supply good reading.

When the press becomes free, as we proposed last week, by the removal of the toll-gatherer, it will be not a whit more 'secular' than the pulpit.

It strikes us that the religious and conservative authorities of the present day (when the press is fast becoming the principal teacher, eclipsing schools and pulpits,) are 'penny-wise and pound-foolish' in their vain attempt to secure to the clergy that monopoly of the Sabbath, which originated in the times of printless poverty and darkness. The effect of the attempt, is to restrain the power of the religious and conservative press, (which is forbidden to issue Sunday papers,) and make over the best reading day in the week to the sole use of those who 'fear not God nor regard man.'

The Tribune professes to be conservative and respectful toward religion, and calls the Herald the 'Satanic press.' And yet the Tribune fires six shots while the Herald fires seven. The 'Satanic press' has the field to itself on Sunday, when the people have the most leisure to read. And Providence verily seems to favor the free; for arrivals of the most eagerly expected news are almost sure to happen on Saturday night, giving the first benefit to the Sunday Herald, and making the Monday Tribune stale to a large portion of its regular readers, who fill the weekly vacuum left by the Tribune, by buying the Sunday Herald.

Men will eat their breakfast Sunday morning, as usual; and the great machinery of occurrences, and intelligence, will go on in spite of 'morality'; and people who make a newspaper a part of their breakfast six days in the week, are not likely to fast very faithfully on the seventh, even if the Tribune shuts up shop, and the clergy claim exclusive attention.

The Sunday press generally, in these cities, is said to be very unprincipled. This, if true, is certainly very alarming; for the Sunday papers are numerous, popular, growing in circulation, and occupy the best day in the week. Is it wise or moral for the godly to abandon the market, when demand is greatest, for the sake of continuing the clerical monopoly which grew up in a state of things that has passed away?

Paul says 'the strength of sin is the law'; and truly a sermon ought to be preached from this text, to those who make the law of the Sabbath a shackle to the righteous and an advantage to the wicked.—We hold it to be self-evident, that so long as the wicked are more free in the use of tools than the righteous, the world will be governed by a kakistocracy.

Good Will to Man.

Persons whose faith exposes them to persecution and peril from bigotry and unbelief, are sometimes in danger of a feeling like misanthropy—as though their destiny in pursuing the

truth, was to lead them into everlasting variance with mankind. We should carefully avoid any such conclusion, and let no provocation of present injury, for conscience' sake, abate our cordiality and hopefulness of heart towards the world.

For it is not true that we are in a war with mankind, or any thing like it. On the contrary, we are in the deepest sympathy with them. And the world is really not offended with us. As between us and the universal man, the deep unexpressed life of the race, there is the best understanding and fellowship. Like the gospel, and like all the true genius that ever was, we are doing and expressing what is deepest in all good men, but which the conventionalities of selfishness, the law and the devil, have hitherto hindered from development. It is only the superficial life that dwells in conventionalities, and is in contact with the spirit of Satan, that is offended and makes trouble. There is no occasion, then, for any unkindness towards men, whatever may be the appearances of hostility from them. The quarrel is after all unreal, and cannot be permanent. We will heartily consider ourselves in partnership with mankind, bound to do them all the good we can; our experience shall be that of public agents of the common good; and in suffering wrong we will remember that the real heart of the world is not our enemy, but our ally and friend.

Scenes of the Last Summer.—No. 2.

BY J. H. N.

My last number left us under the pelting of an editorial storm, but cheered with the hope of raising the sloop in a few days. The reader is now requested to shift the scene from the wreck to Rondout, and to suppose that some four weeks have passed away; during which the sloop has been raised, the dead buried, &c. Smith and myself are boarding at a hotel, engaged in repairing the vessel, and settling bills. A new controversy now breaks out in the paper, as follows:

From the Rondout Courier.

THE ONEIDA COMMUNITY.

South Rondout, August 27, 1851.

MR. EDITOR:—The recent accident, the sinking of the Rebecca Ford, seems to have called into activity the vituperation and resentment of some of the people in this vicinity against an Association usually known among us as Perfectionists. I noticed not long since an article in the Courier which seems to indicate that you too were carried along with the general current.

Of the society in question, in its moral and social bearings, I know but little, and will say nothing; having no desire to be, and they, I presume, caring as little to have me thought, their vindicator, who seem so well able to vindicate themselves. But perhaps the statement of a simple fact would tend to shade with a brighter color the impressions of many who know nothing of the individuals who compose this society, except by hearsay. I think that common justice, perhaps humanity, demands this statement; or a concordance with the old maxim that 'one good turn deserves another' would surely elicit it, now that every body seems against, and none expresses commiseration for, those who suffered so sorrowing an ordeal, as well as much pecuniary loss, by the late sad disaster. During 'last season' I had a sloop that sunk by striking on a rock in the Hell Gate, above New York. Immediately after the occurrence I saw several acquaintances who each expressed their sympathy in some casual remark, as that 'it was an unlucky accident,' or something to that effect—but that was all. I next sought some men whose calling it was to raise sunken vessels, but their charges were so exorbitant I deemed it judicious rather to abandon the vessel than to employ them.

Fortunately I went on board the Rebecca Ford, (this same Rebecca Ford) being previously acquainted with Mr. Smith, (the anathematized Abram Smith.) To him I made known our situation, asking his assistance with his vessel in raising ours. He replied, that as he had business for his vessel, he did not wish to help us for the purpose of making money; but to aid us in a misfortune and to serve and please his master, God, by doing good unto his fellow men, he would go, and charge us no more than would be sufficient to meet his expenses during the time of his stay.

There was nothing in all this, however, I valued half so much as his friendly words of sympathy and care-assuaging kindness, and the willingness and cheerfulness that all exhibited in aiding us—which, under similar circumstances, men with other motives than theirs would have been likely to have done grudgingly.

Mr. Smith and crew stayed with us about a week, during which time I saw several other members of the Association, all of whom seemed to be men of unusual intelligence and Christian kindness, and I never in that time, or at any other time, heard from them one single word approaching the profane or vulgar, or even a ribald jest. Their conversation and talk throughout was moral, instructive and religious, and gave me the highest conception of their moral purity, their love of truth and of God.

At different times we were visited by several of the leading members of the Association, who joined in and worked 'hard and hearty' to aid us, without hope of reward, at least from us; among them I recollect Mr. Cragin and Mr. Noyes, gentlemen whom I should think entitled to the highest consideration for their literary research and wisdom.

During all their stay we lived with them on board

their sloop, had the efficient aid of Mr. Smith and men, and when, after the expiration of several months, I found it convenient to settle with them, I paid them, I believe, thirty dollars. A remarkable contrast to the 'pile' charged for raising the Rebecca Ford, which was about seven hundred dollars, not including remuneration for the vessels employed in raising her.

By giving the above a place in your paper, you will I think, be doing a fair thing for these people, and very much oblige,

Yours, &c. J. D. HYDE.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR OF THE COURIER.

We publish the above letter cheerfully as an act of justice to all concerned, and regard it, as far as it goes, as pretty well establishing the general morality and disinterested humanity of the community. It also shows Mr. Hyde in a very good point of view, and we will not quarrel with him for his great faith in all the Community professes and ought to be.

Our first remarks may have inadvertently done injustice to the Oneida Community in this wise:

We looked upon Abram Smith, if not their leader, at least as the most prominent of the sect as they appeared hereabout. Our general impression of their doctrines was taken from the lewd pranks played at [now] South Rondout in 1840, when Smith was the leader of the set there, and Mrs. Cragin a prominent member. Knowing the connection of these persons with that nest, and finding the twain together in another Communist circle, it was very natural to suppose that the Rebecca Ford was managed on the same principles as governed at the South Rondout homestead. It would have been equally fair to conclude that a parent community which gathered such disciples in its fold, must have something rotten in its constitution, if it inculcated, developed or even tolerated the practices of which we have spoken. But our idea was that the whole Oneida Community of 1851 was embraced in the few on the R. Ford, and the whole of the Community of 1840 in the libidinous set at South Rondout, and further that their tenets were not published at large.

In this it seems that we were in error, and it is claimed that a large Association exists under this name, marked by peculiarities of tenet as laid down by their leader, (Noyes,) and exhibited in the walk and conversation of the members. Mr. Long's communication gave Noyes' theory in brief. We have neither time nor inclination to enter the barren field of polemics on the whole system, but will merely say our say of the practical exhibition of their doctrines & the mode of life they appear to have shaped.

A friend has given us a publication called 'the Berean,' and a partial autobiography of its author, Noyes. The autobiography is the best exhibit of the doctrines and their tendencies extant. We would infer from it that the writer is a sincere zealot, and does not willingly mislead his disciples; that so far as his own teachings and example go, he will not lead them astray; but that the errors of practice so glaringly shown in 1840, are almost inevitable to such a system, adopted by a mixed multitude. Whatever may be nominally the doctrines of the sect as to Antinomianism, they are to all intents and purposes purely of that heresy. The idea of gaining a state of perfection—i. e. perfect obedience to God's will, and taking all impulses as the direct indices of the Almighty, and of course unalloyed by sin, we take it is Antinomianism, call it what you will. Such doctrines in the hands of a man of cultivated and disciplined mind are not dangerous per se. He will keep his body under, even at the cost of the suffering endured by Mr. N. in his struggles, and his reasoning powers and general knowledge of the divine economy will prevent his being misled or misdirected by oracles of the devil. But the same doctrines badly understood by uncultivated and narrow minds, and minds at the mercy of the gross bodies and sensual organizations they inhabit, will ask no better license for swinish tendencies than this very sweeping doctrine of natural impulses being manifestations from the Most High. Mr. Noyes has seen this tendency before. The Perfectionists of his first organization, on his own showing, fell into precisely the same lascivious practices as exhibited in the South Rondout orgies. If he were not above the approaches of ordinary reason, he would have questioned, himself, whether, on its second or third or fourth development in some of the disciples, there was not something terribly wrong in the doctrine or in the mode of carrying it out—whether, though he himself might fight and resist the world, the flesh, and the devil, all who came into the fold on a bare credenda were prepared for the good fight, and the temptations held out by that creed.

Now our view of the Community is, that it is made up of two or three kinds of folk. Mr. Noyes represents the honest and vigorous and high toned zealot who can keep his flesh under, though with sore trial; who can trust his disciplined impulses, and who is hardly likely to be duped by an impulsive command against all his received and established knowledge of God. Mr. Long is a simple minded, credulous, honest disciple, taking his views at second hand, willing to be taught and led aright, and not likely to go astray on his own motion. There are others of the sect very enthusiastic, very impulsive, not good reasoners, nor of great mental grasp; very good as long as they are kept so, fond of excitement and novelty, (ordinarily found in sufficiency in their communion,) but then they have powerful devils to contend with, for we are very sure they cannot keep the flesh under as Mr. Noyes appears to have done, and their impulses taking them the way of all flesh, they very naturally 'go the entire swine,' as illustrated in 1840. Now we take it, the bulk of the numbers of the community will be like No. 2 and 3 of our illustrations, and very few indeed like No. 1. There will much oftener be more intense specimens of the latter than distant approaches to the former in the character of the masses of such communities. Release a number of ordinary communists from the discipline of Mr. N. and give them a separate existence, let them follow their 'impulses' and live aloof and cut off from the world and in their own peculiar social way, and (all the world to a China orange!) the spiritual love will soon take a warmer hue, the impulses a direction not exactly towards the temple of Diana, and the result will be precisely what has been the result in all such rites from the glowing mysteries of Isis on the Nile down to the orgies on the Plantase kill. This at least is the conclusion one naturally arrives at from the experiments of which we are cognizant.

The fact that the South Rondout communists were cut off from the Oneida Community for their acts, proves that the public were not astray in their knowl-

edge of the indecencies at that place, and it also shows that the tenets of the whole sect are theoretically at variance with such practices. But the people, like ourselves, were not aware that the community under whose name they flourished embraced more than the South Rondout flock in its limits. Nor could they know that the South Rondout leaders had been excommunicated, received again after severe probation, and were now to be ranked among the purists. In the hope that all the communists will continue to the end fully worthy of the encomiums so deservedly accorded by Mr. Hyde in his experience, is the sincere wish of the Courier.

A WORD OF EXPLANATION.

Rondout, Sep. 10, 1851.

MR. EDITOR:—In Mr. Hyde's letter laudatory of the Oneida Community in the last Courier, he travelled considerably out of his beat, and a very long shot out of his knowledge, to insinuate that our charge for raising the Rebecca Ford was enormous.

The R. F. was sunk in 65 feet water, fully laden with limestone, and lay on her beam's ends. Noyes and Abram Smith in this emergency applied to me (at that time ill and a-bed,) to undertake the job of raising her, and accordingly I undertook the task, taking a competent force of experienced hands and proceeding to the spot where the R. F. was submerged. We went to work and pushed the job with all speed. On or about the tenth day of work, just when we had a secure hold of the vessel, there was some talk by Noyes and Smith of abandoning the vessel. I then said if they did I should raise her on my own hook, and exonerate them from further charge. They however told me to go on, and I did so, raising her and bringing her to Rondout in about 21 days. My charges are the ordinary charges for good men at such work. My bills can all be verified as to accuracy. I invite scrutiny, if anybody interested wishes to make it. The total bills reached about \$682. There is not one unnecessary or unreasonable charge there, and the most of this sum was paid out by me for labor. The other expenses incurred by the R. F. (for scows, &c.) I am told make the whole cost of raising about \$1000. The owners now say the vessel was worth only half that, and attempt in various ways (as for example in Hyde's letter,) to establish the idea that I have overcharged, and in fact 'shaved' the Community. Now it will be seen from the plain facts above that I was hired to do the job at ordinary rates; that I undertook and completed it in good faith; that my charges are only the ordinary ones for such labor, and that of course I had a right to expect prompt payment and no abuse at their hands. If Noyes and Smith had doubts as to the worth of the vessel to cover costs, they should have started on the idea of a limit to expense; if they felt doubtful at the end of ten days, then they should have given up the vessel to me on my plain proposition; but telling me to go on, and having no grounds to question my items, they should have paid their bill without shrinking from the consequences of their own judgment.

It was after the vessel was raised and the bodies of the two females recovered, that I first heard of their serious doubts as to the wisdom of their outlay. This was in no respect any business of mine, particularly as they never asked my opinion beyond the question of 'whether she could be raised or no.'

I did Noyes and Smith's business as I do all else in my line, according to order, at fair established charges, where no specific contract is made. And I do for the Communists just what I would do for any other men, and no more, holding it dishonorable to have one rule of right for Jews, another for Greeks, and a third for barbarians.

I will add, since I am compelled to speak of my business thus publicly, that I did not get my pay for this labor, but was told to wait till the Lord had furnished them the means. I do not speak of this contemptuously, but to show that people who use a sort of sectarian slang for ordinary transactions, are very often put in questionable positions. They doubtless meant that I must wait till some of their resources were realized, a note came due, or something of that sort. I took it so, but am not content to take Mr. Hyde's insinuations in the same way, for he is not one of the Community. Yours, &c.,

R. T. BISHOP, Agent.

FURTHER EXPLANATION.

Rondout, Sept. 14, 1851.

MR. EDITOR:—As the Oneida Community, with all its heresies, values itself somewhat on its orthodoxy in money matters, and has thus far, here and elsewhere, escaped the reproach of being slack in paying its debts, allow me to say a word by way of explaining the 'questionable position' in which Mr. Bishop is trying to place us.

We employed Mr. Bishop to raise the Rebecca Ford, partly because we could find nobody else, (though we find since that several were seeking the job and were willing to have taken it for \$350,) and partly because he owed me \$300 borrowed money which has long been kept back in a very 'questionable' manner, but which we hoped to find him willing to bring into our account in this business. Whether this was a reasonable hope or not, we were prepared at the outset with cash in hand to meet the amount of expense which Mr. Bishop led us to expect. We asked him before we started, to say how soon he expected to get the vessel up, as we wished to send for friends of the women deceased. He named Saturday the third day from the commencement of preparation. If he had done what he led us to expect, or anything near like it, we should have had no difficulty in paying all demands at once; but he lured us along from day to day by a series of false judgments (I might almost say promises) just like this first one, till instead of a three days' bill, we had a twenty-three day's bill to pay, which at \$50 a day amounted to a sum which it is difficult to raise in a moment in these tight times.

Mr. Bishop gives us no credit at all for what we have done, but leaves the public to suppose that we have paid nothing; whereas we have paid him \$100, as his bill shows, though we have paid Mr. Hathaway, the owner of one of the vessels employed, nothing, and he does not complain.

The truth is that we proposed to abandon the attempt which Bishop was making, (not the ownership in the vessel) on the tenth day, simply because we saw we could not promptly meet the bills which were running up; and this we said to him. He insisted upon going on, and deluded us into the hope, 'that he had, as he says, 'got a secure hold of the vessel,' and

would get her up in a day or two more. But the work lingered on through twelve days after this, notwithstanding the secure hold, and notwithstanding Mr. Bishop's 'competent force of experienced hands.' In fact, he sunk in expenses more than the worth of the vessel, after we judged it best to stop, and after he had certainly all possible means of knowing the difficulties of the job. Under these circumstances we do not feel altogether responsible for the 'questionable position' in which we find ourselves.

Several of Mr. Bishop's statements of facts need to be corrected. He says 'the Rebecca Ford was sunk in 55 feet water, fully laden with lime-stone, and lay on her beams' ends.' All three of these items are incorrect. I sounded about the wreck myself and found about 42 feet of water. The sloop dumped her deck load when she sunk, as I knew at the time, and as it proved when she came up, so that she had only the load in her hold, which was reckoned by Mr. Ward, the owner of the stone, at 20 tons, a full load being 73 tons. The vessel could not have been on her beams' ends, as her mast was from the first not less than six feet out of water at high tide. Mr. Bishop puts the time of the job at 21 days. It was 23 days from the commencement of preparation, as charged in Mr. Hathaway's bill, and more than 22 days from the commencement of work at the wreck.

Mr. Bishop says, that 'it was after the vessel was raised, and the bodies of the two females recovered, that [he] first heard of [our] serious doubts as to the wisdom of [our] outlay.' This cannot be true, for he says himself that we talked of abandoning the job on the tenth day, and the bodies were not recovered till the thirteenth day. As Mr. Bishop invites a scrutiny of his bill, here it is at full length. Let it speak for itself:

Sloop Rebecca Ford, to Chas. M. Ketcham.	Dr.
To use of screws, timber, &c., 20 days, at 40s.	\$100.00
Cash paid for provisions.	42.38
Twenty ft. of plank for wedges, at 6d.	1.20
Paid extra men.	5.50
Loss of screw, crow-bar and shackle-bar.	15.00
Use of horse and wagon.	4.00
Use of chain from N. Y., 15 days, at 24s.	45.00
J. Pratt, 36 1-2 days, at 17s.	77.76
C. Pratt, 34 do. do.	72.25
J. Fleming, 25 do. do.	53.12
Bishop, 37 1-2 do. do.	79.68
J. Graham, 21 1-2 do. do.	45.68
C. Guman, 1 1-2 do. do.	3.19
P. Mindly, 17 do. do.	36.12
J. Croswan, 14 do. do.	29.75
P. Shurt, 1 do. do.	2.12
C. Ketcham, 12 1-2 do. do.	26.56
S. Thomas, 15 do. at 14s.	20.25
S. Dady, 7 do. do.	12.25
J. Hanes, 12 do. do.	12.00
	\$682.81
Cr. by cash.	\$63.00
By 202 feet pine timber.	40.40
	103.40
	\$579.41

Add to this Mr. Hathaway's bill (\$220), and Mr. Hamilton's, (\$133) and the sum total is \$1,045; not including the extra bills for Bishop's provisions, our own expenses, the labor of our own men, the damage which Bishop did to the vessel, (amounting to several hundred dollars,) &c. &c.

To sum up. By Mr. Bishop's management we find ourselves in the 'questionable position' of owing some \$1,100, a part of which we cannot pay readily unless he, and others hereabouts, can manage to help us by turning in what they owe us; and we have to ask for the charitable judgment of the public, and patience of our creditors, till we can 'turn ourselves' which we shall do as soon as possible.

Yours respectfully, A. C. SMITH.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR OF THE CIRCULAR.

P. S. Mr. J. D. Hyde sends us a sort of reply to Mr. Bishop. The length of the communication from Mr. Smith, the principal in the difference, would exclude this volunteer aid, even if it were fair to allow a third person to enter into a discussion which has taken the shape of a question of facts between the individuals directly interested. All that Mr. H. can justly ask, is the publication of his avowed disclaimer of any intention of whitewashing the communists by his letter, and his assertion that said letter was written on his own motion and aimed at a bare statement of facts.

From the Rondout Courier of Sept. 26th.

A NOTE ON THE EXPLANATION.

Mr. A. C. Smith, by the publication of Mr. Ketcham's bill for work in raising the Rebecca Ford, has spared me the pains of doing so myself. The items of that bill are indisputable, at established rates.

If he thinks differently he has his remedy. The wisdom of the outlay for the recovery of the vessel, now esteemed so lightly, is none of my business. If Mr. Smith could have had the R. F. raised for \$350, why did he not do it? He came to me as a last resort, and acceded to plain terms of work by the day.—Had I taken the work at a job, then his complaints would have been all right as to overcharge had I exceeded the compensation settled, and been fool enough to send in a bill beyond stipulation. But the charges are just, and if Mr. S. thinks the time wrong he can correct himself by referring to Mr. Hathaway's bill, to which he raises no objection, and he will find Mr. H. charges for half a day more than Mr. Ketcham includes. If he sticks so much to exactness, let him add half a day to our time.

If I erred in judgment as to the time likely to be required for the job, it was unintentional. No exact calculations can be made in such cases, and Mr. S. and his friends on the spot were able to correct my opinions by their own experience, and their knowledge of their own vessel and its situation. Four men who sounded the spot, agree with me in my statement of the depth of water at flood, which is the usual way of taking depth. The Rebecca Ford was on her beam ends, and to prove this it is only necessary to show the fact that the bulwarks were cut to the beams by the chains used in swinging her up.—The job was unsought, was not an agreeable one at best, and was done with all the skill and speed of which I am capable. I was ready at any time to abandon the attempt on their account, if Mr. S. or his partners had decided so; but with all the means of judging of the probability and time of getting her up as plainly as myself, and better knowledge as to the worth of the vessel to repay the outlay, they continued the work. It is true the doubtful idea of success was first broached on the tenth day, and an abandonment merely mooted for a brief time, but it was not until after the recovery

of the bodies that any decided question was raised as to the propriety of persistence, or the indifference dating thence manifested.

In regard to the \$300 note of Wm. H. Bridger & Co., which Mr. S. chooses to say he proposed turning in upon Mr. Ketcham's account, it is only necessary to say that W. H. B. & Co. made over all their assets to assignees to meet their debts as far as they could, and this \$300 debt, incurred by exchange of accommodation paper, was a liability of that firm, and in no way connected with Mr. Ketcham's affairs.

R. T. BISHOP, Agent.

MORE ABOUT THE REBECCA FORD.

Rondout, Sept. 29, 1851.

MR. EDITOR:—Mr. Bishop rejoices in my exhibition of his bill. Allow me therefore to gratify him further by calling particular attention to one or two choice items in it.

We are charged \$100 for the use of screws, timbers, &c., and \$15 for the loss of a screw and two bars. All the screws and timbers that Bishop furnished could be bought for less than \$115.

He charges us \$45 for the use of a chain which we understand he bought in N. York for less than \$90.

He credits himself with 37 1-2 days work. If he did actually get up from a sick bed, as he says in his first article, and perform 37 1-2 days' work in 20 solar days, he is a remarkable man.

He credits J. Fleming in our bill with 25 days' work. Fleming, when he was pressing Bishop to a settlement, came to us with his lawyer to ascertain this item, and told us then and afterwards that Bishop had allowed him only 12 1-2 day's work, and said that he did not perform more than 20 day's work at the utmost.

I trust the public will, for its own sake, take particular notice that Bishop has not only made out this bill against us, but has twice publicly asserted that it is a reasonable bill. Those who deal with him, should make their calculations accordingly.

A word more should be said about Bishop's mistake of facts. His first statement was that 'the Rebecca Ford was sunk in 55 feet water, fully laden with lime-stone, and lay on her beams' ends.' In his last note he has dropped the second of these items, viz: that she was 'fully laden with lime-stone.' This is so glaringly inconsistent with her being on her beams' ends, that it is a wonder he ever ventured the statement. But he still insists that the sloop was in 55 feet water, and that she was on her beams' ends. These statements sadly quarrel with each other; for if she was in 55 feet water, and any where near on her beams' ends, her mast must have been wholly and far under water; whereas, it is notorious that the mast was from the first not less than six feet out of water at high tide. The actual angle of inclination can be calculated very accurately. Not more than 70 feet of her mast (reckoning from the keel) was ever submerged. Taking then Bishop's measurement of the depth, (55 feet,) it is evident that she was heeled over only enough to sink 15 feet of her mast. The inclination in degrees may be found thus: The submerged portion of the mast, which is 70 feet, is the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle, of which one side (the perpendicular depth) is 55 feet. By the rule that the square of the hypotenuse is equal to the square of the two other sides, we ascertain that the third side, viz: the distance on the surface of the water between the mast and the perpendicular, is about 43 feet. This represents the sine of the angle in question. The arc of that angle would be a little more—say 45 feet. The whole circle, of which the mast is the radius, is 420 feet. Then as 420 is to 360, (the circle of degrees,) so is 45 to about 38 1-2—the number of degrees of the inclination of the vessel. If she had been on her beams' ends the inclination would have been 90 degrees.

We charge nothing for this demonstration, and nobody need pay any attention to it. It may gratify some to see exactly how near Bishop came to the truth. His three items—the 55 feet water, the full load, and the beam-end position—remind one of the lawyer, who in pleading a case in which his client was charged with breaking a borrowed kettle, commenced thus: 'May it please the Court, we shall prove in the defense of this case, first, that the kettle was broke when he got it; second, that it was whole when he sent it home; and third, that he never had it!'

I said in my former article that Bishop 'sunk in expense more than the worth of the vessel after we judged it best to stop, and after we certainly had all possible means of knowing the difficulty of the job.' The printer mistook the word 'he,' noted in the last clause of the sentence, and printed it 'we,' which materially alters the intent of the statement. We had not the means of knowing the difficulties of the job, but he had; and he assured us on the tenth day that he had 'got a secure hold on the vessel,' and on the strength of this assurance we allowed him to go on.

As Bishop, with a 'competent force of experienced hands' at command (for which we have to pay at ship carpenter rates) was ten days in getting a 'secure hold,' and twelve days after that in getting the vessel up, I am authorized by all good judges to say that, if it is true that the job was done as he says, 'with all the skill and speed of which he is capable,' then he is not a competent man for such business, and by inference, is not competent for any business which requires special mechanical judgment. And this fact ought to be known. He ought to confess it, and no longer injure the public by assuming responsibilities for which he is not qualified.

He says that if we think his bill extortionate, we have our remedy—meaning the law. It is pretty well understood that litigation is a poor remedy for injustice—especially litigation with a man who has Bishop's faculty of pleading irresponsibility, and hiding under his Bridgers and Ketchams. We would rather pay, than spatter in that puddle. We have proposed to submit the matter to referees, but Ketcham says—No; we have just been refereed out of \$400. We will have the whole or none.' Accordingly the bill has been sued and the Sloop attached.

We now offer the Sloop for sale. She has been thoroughly repaired; her stern has been rebuilt on an improved model; she is well known as a very convenient, fast-sailing vessel. We will give a good bargain and our thanks besides, to any one who will purchase her for cash or sureties which will enable us to satisfy the hungry demands which are pursuing us.

Respectfully yours, A. C. SMITH.

For the sake of concluding the financial part of our story here, I will add, that we finally sold the

sloop, for about twelve hundred dollars, to Mr. Hotaling, the man who witnessed the shipwreck, and rescued the survivors. Our total loss was between six and seven hundred dollars, besides the value of the sloop. We settled all, and escaped from Rondout about the first of October.

[The series of "HOME-TALKS" (continued in this paper from the Oneida Circular,) will be understood to be off-hand conversational lectures, spoken at our evening fireside, and phonographically reported by Wm. A. HINDS.]

Home-Talk by J. H. N.—No. 70.

[REPORTED FOR THE CIRCULAR, SEPTEMBER 8, 1851.]

ASCETICISM NOT CHRISTIANITY.

We are in a sort of controversy just at this time with Hades. A clash of opinion that has long been preparing, has now come on—hostilities have commenced. The point at issue is in regard to the claims of the dead to superiority over the living. It is customary to refer to Hades as a state superior to this world—a state of transcendent purity and wisdom; and this is precisely what we are now called upon strongly to deny. We have a deep interest in this issue, in many ways. For instance, the popular movement of the 'Rappings' will be completely turned by the position that we are to gain in this controversy. Then our success in claiming our dead back from Hades, and in fact the introduction of the resurrection, will turn on this same point.

The most acceptable theory there is going, about the world of the dead, proposes no resurrection at all. Swedenborg says there is no resurrection except that which takes place at death; and that the interior world [by which he means the invisible, pale world of Hades] to which persons are introduced at death, is properly the superior state. That is Bush's doctrine, and that is the doctrine of these 'Rapping' oracles. Now if we are to give up to that view of the case, we renounce the whole gospel of Christ. But, on the other hand, if it turns out that Hades is an inferior condition—that the heavens there are to be overhauled—that the state of things existing there is not permanent, but that there is to be a resurrection, which is now partly accomplished—and that spirits are to return to their connection with matter;—if this is the true doctrine, then we are right in reducing, at once, the current imaginations about Hades, and clearing our understandings on the point of its inferiority to this world.

The question between us and Hades, is the old question between Christ and asceticism. The superiority of Hades, if there is any, consists in its separation from gross matter. That is its ground of claim. It is alleged that here, we are in gross, vile bodies—earthly and carnal, as compared with the disembodied state. A whole system of philosophy has been formed on that assumption, and a whole system of religion; and I might say nearly all the religions of the world, but that of Christ, (and that has been so perverted as to fall in with the rest,) have been founded on the doctrine that matter is gross and defiling—that virtue and purity consist in deliverance from it, in abstinence from sensual pleasures, &c., and finally in death—divorce from the body altogether. We touch now upon a vast controversy,—old as the world, and wide as creation.

Let us go back, then, to the beginning.—God breathed on the face of the deep—his spirit brooded upon the waters, and God flashed light through the creation. He formed the heavens and the earth, and caused the earth to bring forth abundantly of animals and vegetables. God joined himself to matter—possessed himself of it—entered into a marriage conjunction with it. He was not afraid of it; he did not count it mischievous and diabolical; but on the contrary, his spirit lovingly brooded upon it; [see in the original,] his life entered into it, and caused it to bring forth with all possible fertility. Here is certainly a true marriage connection between God and matter. And he pronounced the result 'very good;' evidently he was mightily pleased with it.

Well, this union, whose celebration forms the first and sublimest chapter in history, has

never been severed. Christ says, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' 'That same marriage relation that God entered into with matter at the beginning, has continued to exist.—'The gifts and callings of God are without repentance;' and if he brought about a marriage that he called 'very good,' we may be sure that he will never forsake his wife. Let us keep that fact in view as a foundation to build upon; it is the first fact in the great history.

Now let us look a step further, at man's original relation to matter, and at the nature of the quarrel that he came into with matter, which results in the constant labor to divorce himself from it, with the idea that that is the way to purity. We shall thus test the quality of this universal reverence for death and Hades. Let us see what were God's ideas of purity at the beginning, and who it is that has dishonored his chosen creation, and exalted death and hell into its place?

God placed Adam and Eve in the garden, and surrounded them with the greatest means of enjoyment in connection with matter. He gave them capabilities of happiness in union with each other, and capabilities of happiness in connection with the animal and vegetable kingdoms, and said to them, 'Of every tree of the garden, (except one) you may freely eat.' We need not refer this expression merely to the trees of the garden; the real meaning is, you may appropriate to yourselves and enjoy every living, growing thing; all pleasure is yours. So, it may be said that human beings themselves were trees of the garden—they are things that grow. All possible enjoyment in connection with matter, was offered to them, with a single exception.

That does not look like asceticism—does not look as though matter was necessarily unsanctified and debasing—does not look as though the enjoyment of material things was in God's mind unhealthy, mischievous. But on the contrary, it was the very business that he set Adam and Eve about, AND NO OTHER—the enjoyment of material substances. God did not ask Adam even to praise himself; and did not set him to work like a paddy; but turned him into a clover-field, and told him to enjoy himself all he could.

Now we come to the cause and commencement of the quarrel. The serpent came in and found there was one little exception to the privileges of the garden, and laying out all his energies on that point, he brought about a transgression, and of course a quarrel of spirit on the part of Adam toward his Maker. Separation commenced between God and man—between man and man, and between man and nature. There was a spiritual infusion by the devil between these parties that were previously united. What is the result? The result is, that the evil, the irritation which commenced with the eating of a single fruit, spread in the man's spirit, through all his relations to matter. Satan, by this operation, PLACED HIMSELF between man and matter. It was Satan's object from the first to get into man's spirit, so that he could enjoy the beautiful things that God had made. It was a usurpation of the devil, of a condemned spirit, who, knowing that he was excluded, was yet greedy of all the things that God had made. He, on the one hand, infused into man this greedy and condemned spirit, and on the other, connected himself with matter. But Satan has no right to the good things of this world. It is an illegitimate marriage.

Following this, he made man believe that it was through matter that he had been defiled; and in this way, the hardness toward God is kept up. Then it is important that man should find a way to purify himself; and with this in view, he gets up his religion, the first idea of which is, that he is debased by matter—by eating and drinking—by the sexual connection—by connection with a gross body, &c. These are the things that have defiled him, and now he must go to work and clear himself from them. Here you see is a mistake in the first thought. Instead of matter having debased him, it is the devilish

spirit between him and matter that alone works the evil. But man is not spiritual enough to understand that, and his religion is accordingly built up on the idea that his body is gross and his passions vile—that it is a bad thing to eat and drink, and a shameful thing to express love; and in short, that we shall be a great deal more spiritual if we cast off our bodies altogether. These ideas are the basis of the religion of the world; and even the heathen, in attempting to get up a religion, start on that basis.

Now see what this state of things is tending to. Going back to the beginning, we find God in conjunction with matter—married to it—the life and soul of it. He pronounced the union 'very good.' This being so, it is evident that in the true and natural order of things, matter, instead of debasing man, would spiritualize him; it would purify him; and he would really 'look through nature up to nature's God.' He would find God not in a centrifugal, but in a centripetal way—looking through this beautiful universe to the God behind it. All enjoyments would be ordinances attracting him towards God. That is the legitimate idea of the thing. But man, standing on the outside of matter, and not on the inside where God is, the devil comes into partnership with him, and puts into him the idea that instead of worshipping God through his works, he must keep away from matter, as the only way to become purified, and so gets him looking right in the opposite direction from that which God intended he should. God being the interior of quickened matter, the attempt to escape from matter—to renounce its enjoyments—is precisely an attempt to divorce ourselves from God.

Asceticism, then, plainly is not the true religion, but is the opposite of true religion. It is a religion which, in the spirit of falsehood, has introduced into human nature ideas, the direct tendency of which is to turn mankind outward from God, into outer darkness—into the inane.

Now we come to the more practical question, *What is the true religion?* How is human nature to be managed with reference to matter? It is evident that in the present state of things material enjoyments are unfavorable to spirituality. And in fact the religion that Christ introduced, has more or less of the restrictive element—something like asceticism in it. It leads to temperance, fasting, and even abstinence from sensual pleasures to a great extent. And reason and instinct agree with Christianity in telling us that there must be a great deal of self-denial—that there is no other way of redemption. How is this to be explained so as to make the distinction clear between true religion, and the false, ascetic, anti-creationism that has been described? I understand the matter thus: A person truly inclined to good—having control of his passions and able to manage himself correctly—would in the first place assume that matter is pure and holy, sanctified by God, and not his tormentor; but that the spirit that has infused itself into human nature, is the real mischief. He would then direct all his efforts in the way of abstinence, to the point of separating himself from that spirit. This would be the legitimate working of things. That spirit has no right to these enjoyments; and so long as it is in him, it behooves him to see that it is not gratified. But observe, the object of his ascetic labors will be to starve out a spirit; to separate himself not from matter, but from the evil medium that is between him and matter. Then when he refuses enjoyments, he may do it, as he would say to his wife,—I am not going to depart from you, but it is best for us both to separate for the present, for fasting and good purposes. He could say that respectfully to matter, with no idea but that matter is holy, and that they will yet be lovingly united. Strictly in this way, as a matter of policy toward the common enemy, it is good for a man to abstain from sensual enjoyment.

Suppose that God undertakes to save a man—to redeem him from the devil's power, and

bring him into a true state with regard to matter. The first working of grace in his heart will be in the line of temperance, restriction, abstinence, with a view to starving out the evil spirit that has come between him and matter. Now we can see that a natural tendency of this experience would be, to produce in the person a feeling of alienation towards matter itself. Here, then, is the great point of labor with God, to purify men without their running into asceticism and taking up the idea that there is to be a permanent divorce of matter and spirit. There is a falsehood about this thing running through the whole philosophy of the world, which makes people, in one sense, in love with death itself, as the supposed way of escape from the pollutions they are in. This is really a quarrel with God;—it is looking at things in a narrow-minded way—choosing the inferior for the superior—putting death before life.

I perceive in looking into the life of Dr. Payson, and at the best religion of the churches for the last 1800 years, that salvation with them has been only of this negative kind—this preliminary stage, in which the labor is to starve out the illegitimate life. That is the height of the perfection that has been attained; there has been but very little if any advancement toward the final relation of man to matter. To a great extent the idea has become prevalent in the churches, as well as in Hades, that God is opposed to matter, and that holiness consists in divorce from it. I suppose that God has commenced correcting that mistake, in our experience. It is given to us to fight out the issue, and recover, and return to, the original union with matter. Up to the time that I embraced the truth of holiness, and came into the power of eternal life, my experience had been of this preliminary, abstenious kind. I carried that principle out to its fullest extent—conquered my body, and had full command of my passions—was perfectly willing to abstain from every enjoyment, and willing to die.—That is all you will find in Payson. There is nothing in his experience that I could not match in mine, previous to the change that introduced me to Christ. Since that time I have been going in the opposite direction—have been called to secure and recover the outward world as God's. I have been learning that God loves matter; and that God's children—those who are one with him, have the best right to all the enjoyments of matter. I have been through the experience, both of John the Baptist, and of Christ in this respect. 'John the Baptist came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil: the Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.' By the way, that was a pretty shrewd saying of the Jews concerning John the Baptist; for if a man cannot eat and drink, it is because he has a devil that needs to be starved out.

My religion is now founded on these great principles; that God is married to matter, and has pronounced it 'very good.' Instead of seeking God by abstinence, and making myself a ghost, my experience has been that God is at the centre of life, and is the soul of matter; and I seek him as Adam was to seek him, in the fruits of his work—by eating of the trees of the garden; taking care that I do not eat of poisonous fruit, as Adam did, and that I do not eat to excess. The general turn of my experience has led me to see God, not divorced from matter, but in marriage with it. I claim it; the devil has no right to it—in the name of God, I claim this beautiful universe. I claim all the faculties of our bodies—all our capabilities of enjoyment.

These principles, if they are correct, will satisfactorily explain to the world, my whole experience since 1834. They offer the means of unravelling whatever mystery there has been in my course.

But to return: these principles bring out the true relation between Hades and this world. They show that this world, so far as there is

in it any legitimate connection with matter, any healthy enjoyment, is just so much nearer to God than disembodied spirits. We are more directly connected with his great machinery than Hades is; that is the truth about it.—Furthermore, our life and existence here, are the core and basis of that disembodied world. We stand related to it, as this solid earth, for instance, is related to the atmosphere that surrounds it. Here is a globe of solid substance; and around it, to the extent of forty miles in depth, is an atmosphere, which is far less substantial than the earth, and which derives its elements from the earth. It is a secondary thing—an appendage to the earth. So the world of spirits, Hades, is based on this material existence—this union of life and matter. The elements of that world, like the elements of the atmosphere, come from this existence and return to it. The atmosphere, clouds, thunder storms, &c., boast themselves against the earth, as though they were more ethereal, far superior, and independent of it. But is it so? The truth is, they are wholly derived from the earth, and sustained by it.

Or, to vary the illustration, and liken life to the electric processes, I should say that this world is the active electrical source of all their vitality. Here, where spirit and matter are in connection—where the fire of life is being constantly reproduced—is the galvanic battery which supports Hades and carries on the operations there. In other words, if Hades had not this world for its battery and basis, it would fall into outer darkness and the inane. There is no life where there is no love. Here is the place where positive creation is all the time going on—the highest act of God. We do not learn that this is the fact in Hades.

The relative position of things is not determined by age, respectability and outward circumstances, but by the relation they sustain to God. The great question is, Where is God? Where is the eternal fire of God predominant? The investigations that we are making will bring us to this conception: that God, the angels, and the final church, are interior to us; and that the powers of Hades are exterior to us. Conceiving of the whole of existence as in concentric circles, from God outward, and understanding that the power, majesty, and real value of any circle is in proportion to its proximity to God, then the conclusion is that we come in order, before Hades. The resurrection church is before us, and the whole world of the dead is behind us. This view gives us a clear understanding of that saying of Christ—'He that believeth in me shall never die.' It does not say he shall not disappear from this world; but, in the place of dying, he shall go to a higher place than he is in now. We are in a middle situation, where there are two outlets—one upward and the other downward.

It is here that the great substantial things are done. It was in this world that Christ lived thirty years; he was in Hades but three days. And Christ, when on the earth, showed his fondness for all natural enjoyments. His path through life was directly opposed to asceticism. He took special pains to let the devil know that the body may become the medium of spirituality. He tried to divorce man from the devil, and unite him to matter. The more we understand him, the more we shall see that that is the reconciliation he labored to effect. For this object he destroyed the devil and cast out the prince of this world. His great work and purpose was to destroy the illegitimate spirit, and so bring about again the true original union of man to creation, as well as to God. Having taken on mortality, he was more or less troubled with this illegitimate spirit; and he submitted to death for the purpose of destroying it. As soon as that was accomplished he came back to this world, and claimed his body, and commenced eating and drinking again.

This view shows us what a change must take place in order that things may go right. The balance of power must become centripetal instead of centrifugal. Instead of allowing Hades to draw us outward from God, away from the seat of war, where the devil is to be conquered, and God is to be found; instead of allowing ourselves to be drawn in the centrifugal direction, towards the inane—we must shift the attraction, and draw Hades towards us, towards matter, towards reconciliation. We must sound it through Hades that asceticism, instead of being purity, is the abandonment of God's

beautiful universe to the devil's greediness. I enter my protest before heaven and earth, and I shall sound it world without end, against our friends there becoming ghosts, and being persuaded into the kind of purity that is fashionable in Hades. I feel bound, by every principle of truth and religion and reason, to use all my power of attraction to draw them back into conjunction with matter.

These 'Rapping' oracles, that are filling the world with excitement, show the desire there is in that world to get back into this; the attraction is in this direction. But they must be content to mind their own business; and if they come back here, they must not teach asceticism. On the contrary, we will be careful that the old and true doctrine is taught to them. They will find that they cannot be saved from sin out of the body; and that true, perfect union with God is to be sought in conjunction with matter. They must come back here, and assume their old, forsaken responsibilities, in connection with matter. That responsibility is, to live here with material things and enjoy them truthfully; and it is not to be disposed of by persons running away and becoming ghosts. If they imagine that they are going to throw off their responsibilities in that way, they are greatly mistaken. However pleasant it may be to go off there and dream, and however profitable, they must still understand that their union with God can only come by their returning to the garden of Eden. They are 'righteous overmuch'—righteous above that which is written, if they think they can forsake the ordinances of God's temple and dwell in the outer courts. Hades is but an outer court, and the time has come for all to understand it. It will not do to rest there, and refuse to enter the sanctuary.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Putney, Vt. Nov. 14, 1851.

DEAR BROOKLYN FRIENDS:—As I am a stranger in these parts, having never been in New England before, and am now occupying the place of your former labors and trials, I thought you would like to know my impressions, and how I prosper in my new circumstances.

In regard to this I am happy to say, that as I become acquainted, I am more and more pleased with the place and its surroundings; with my new employment in the mill, and the general aspect of things without. In our own home circle, I need not tell you, we are happy; we thank God for the love and unity we enjoy, and the spiritual communion we feel with Christ our Savior, and through him with all his family. Our prayer is that we may be humble, and partake more and more of the meekness of Christ, and the charity that 'thinketh no evil,' but 'suffereth long and is kind.'

The only drawback on our domestic comfort has been the illness of Mrs. W. She has been seriously indisposed, even threatened with derangement, but we think her improving now. Situated among strangers, it has tried our faith some, and forced us to trust God for all results. Mrs. Langstaff is a great blessing to us. She is an excellent nurse, and as she seasons all she does with faith and prayer, her help is very efficient. We feel grateful to God that he sent her here, and that she is contented and happy after leaving such a home as Brooklyn. She is so, and thanks God daily that she can do his will in this service and labor of love. What a contrast with the spirit that looks to money for reward.

My constant prayer to God is that I may do his will in all things, and honor his cause as a witness for Christ's gospel, a practical gospel of salvation from sin and selfishness. I believe it has a living embodiment in the Oneida Community; and as a member of that body, and disciple of J. H. Noyes, I appreciate the kind and respectful treatment I have received in this place, which has been universal, with one exception.

There is a man by the name of Keyes, with whom I had never spoken before, who as I went in to the post-office on two occasions assailed me with violent taunts for my connection with Perfectionists. As I had given him no cause or provocation for this abuse, and had been otherwise well treated, his attack was very unexpected as well as uncourteous. Perceiving he had a spirit of animosity and bitterness, I refrained from any argument, desiring the spirit that Christ manifested when he suffered wrong. Since that I have met with nothing disagreeable from him or any one else; but general mutual good feeling seems to subsist between us and all our customers, and any with whom we have intercourse. With love for all the Brooklyn family, I remain as ever, Your brother, M. L. WORDEN.

S. R. LEONARD & COMPANY, PRINTERS.

Orders for Job Printing are invited.